arXiv:astro-ph/0510443v3 9 Nov 2005

Generating the curvature perturbation at the end of inflation

David H. Lyth
Physics Department, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YB, UK

The dominant contribution to the primordial curvature perturbation may be generated at the end of inflation. Taking the end of inflation to be sudden, formulas are presented for the spectrum, spectral tilt and non-gaussianity. They are evaluated for a minimal extension of the original hybrid inflation model.

a. Introduction The primordial curvature perturbation ζ exists already a few Hubble times before the observable Universe enters the horizon.[1] Its time-independent value at that stage sets the initial condition for the subsequent evolution of all perturbations in the scalar and adiabatic mode, which in turn seem to the dominant (perhaps the only) cause of inhomogeneity in the Universe. The curvature perturbation is almost gaussian, with an almost scale-independent spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta = (5 \times 10^{-5})^2$.

The curvature perturbation is supposed to originate from the vacuum fluctuations during inflation of one or more light scalar fields, which on each scale are promoted to classical perturbations around the time of horizon exit. Different proposals have been made regarding when and how this happens. In this note I explore a new possibility; that the significant, and possibly dominant, contribution to the curvature perturbation is generated at the end of inflation.

b. Generating the curvature perturbation For clarity I assume Einstein gravity, slow-roll inflation and canonically normalized fields. None of these essential for the generation of the curvature perturbation. What is essential though, to make the curvature perturbation almost scale-independent, is that inflation is almost exponential while cosmological scales leave the horizon, corresponding to a Hubble parameter H which varies slowly on the Hubble timescale.

The slow-roll inflationary trajectory will lie in a subspace of field space, spanned by one or more light fields which are the components of the inflaton. Any additional light fields have a negligible effect on the inflationary trajectory.

We are going to be interested in Fourier modes of the curvature perturbation ζ with a given wavenumber k of cosmological interest. To evaluate them we can smooth the scalar fields on a scale of order $1/k$ (to be precise, on a somewhat smaller scale). This scale leaves the horizon at some epoch $k = aH$, where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the almost-constant inflationary Hubble parameter.

At horizon exit the canonically-normalized fields can be defined so that one of them points along the trajectory; if the inflaton has more than one component I call this the adiabatic component of the inflaton and denote it by ϕ, and call the orthogonal component(s) isocurvature components. If the inflaton does have more than one component, the direction of the trajectory changes slowly on the Hubble timescale.

The vacuum fluctuation of each light field is promoted to a classical perturbation around the time of horizon exit. The perturbation $\delta\phi$ of the adiabatic component (defined just a few Hubble times after horizon exit) gives a contribution to ζ_ϕ, which remains constant until the approach of horizon entry. The first proposals, working in the context of single-component inflation, assumed that no further contribution to ζ is generated, making ζ_ϕ the observed quantity [1, 2]. When multi-component inflation was formulated it was seen [3] that the isocurvature components of the inflaton will generate an additional component to ζ, but it was still assumed that ζ will have settled down to its observed value by the end of inflation. In other words, it was assumed that the curvature perturbation is still generated during inflation.

Later, proposals were made whereby the dominant component of the curvature perturbation (or at least a significant component) is generated only at some post-inflationary epoch. According to most of these proposals the curvature perturbation is generated at, or on the run-up to, some reheating transition. A reheating transition may be defined as the decay of a more or less pressureless component of the cosmic fluid (usually taken to be dominant) into radiation to give a practically radiation-dominated Universe. In the first detailed proposal [4] (see also [5]) the curvature perturbation is generated gradually, when the initially isocurvature density perturbation of some 'curvaton' grows in an unperturbed radiation background. According to different proposals, the curvature perturbation may be generated by an inhomogeneity in the decay rate [6] or the mass [7] of the decaying particle. Further proposals invoke inhomogeneous preheating [8], inhomogeneous thermalization after reheating [9] or the inhomogeneous production of topological defects [10].[2]

In this paper I explore the third logical possibility, that a significant and perhaps dominant component of the curvature perturbation is generated at the transition between inflation and non-inflation.

---

[1] Standard material concerning the early Universe and observation is reviewed for instance in [1, 2].

[2] The proposals of [6, 7, 8] were first mentioned in [11], without any calculation.

c. General formulas During inflation, the light fields ϕ_i correspond by definition to those directions in field space satisfying $|\eta_{ij}| \ll 1$, where

$$\eta_{ij} = M_{\rm P}^2 \frac{\partial^2 V/\partial\phi_i\partial\phi_j}{V} \,. \tag{1}$$

We are assuming slow-roll inflation, which is almost exponential corresponding to $\dot H \ll H^2$. The perturbations of the light fields can be defined on any spacetime slicing which is non-singular [1, 2] in the limit $\dot H/H^2 \to 0$, such as a spatially flat slice. These perturbations are almost massless and non-interacting. They are supposed to vanish at the classical level before horizon exit, corresponding to the vacuum state. A few Hubble times after horizon exit, the vacuum fluctuation has generated classical perturbations $\delta\phi_i(\mathbf{x})$, which vary slowly on the Hubble timescale and are practically gaussian and uncorrelated with each other. Each of them has the same spectrum, $\mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi_i} = (H_k/2\pi)^2$, where H_k is the value of H at horizon exit.

The perturbations $\delta\phi_i(\mathbf{x})$ determine ζ at horizon exit, and they also determine any subsequent evolution of ζ. Such evolution (until the approach of horizon entry) is conveniently described by the δN formalism [3, 12, 13, 14, 15] (see also [16]). Keeping quadratic terms [12], the time-dependent curvature perturbation, smoothed on the scale k, is

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\mathbf{x},t) &= \delta N(k,\phi_i(\mathbf{x}),\rho(t)) \\ &= \sum_i N_i(k,t)\delta\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij} N_{ij}\delta\phi_i\delta\phi_j \,. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here, $N(k,\phi_i,\rho)$ is the number of e-folds, evaluated in an unperturbed universe, from the epoch of horizon exit when the fields have specified values ϕ_i, to an epoch when the energy density has a specified value ρ. In the second line, $N_i \equiv \partial N/\partial\phi_i$ and $N_{ij} \equiv \partial^2 N/\partial\phi_i\partial\phi_j$. These derivatives are evaluated on the unperturbed trajectory, on which the ϕ_i are determined by k making N_i and N_{ij} functions of just k and the final time t.

At some stage before nucleosynthesis, ζ settles down to a time-independent value, which is constrained by observation. We write down the predictions for ζ which follow from Eq. (2), as a function of t even though we are interested in the regime where ζ has settled down to its final value.

Since the observed ζ is almost gaussian, one or more linear terms must dominate Eq. (2) giving the spectrum

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k,t) = \sum_i N_i^2(k,t)(H_k/2\pi)^2 \,. \tag{3}$$

The spectral tilt $n-1 \equiv \partial\ln\mathcal{P}_\zeta/\partial\ln k$ is [1, 14]

$$n-1 = 2\frac{\eta_{jm}N_jN_m}{N_nN_n} - 2\epsilon - \frac{2}{M_{\rm P}^2 N_iN_i} \,, \,. \tag{4}$$

where identical indices are summed over. Here $\epsilon \ll 1$ is a slow-roll parameter, defined as $\frac{1}{2}M_{\rm P}^2(V'/V)^2$ where V' is the derivative of V along the inflationary trajectory. Both ϵ and η_{jm} are to be evaluated at horizon exit.

If the adiabatic component of the inflaton dominates Eq. (2), the non-gaussianity of ζ is too small to ever be observable [18, 20]. Otherwise it may be observable. The likely observables are the bispectrum and trispectrum, which alone are generated by the quadratic expansion (2). They are specified respectively [13] by quantities $f_{\rm NL}$ and $\tau_{\rm NL}$. Taking the field perturbations to be perfectly gaussian, which has been justified for the bispectrum [20, 21], and ignoring the scale-dependence of $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$, the predictions are [12, 13][3]

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{3}{5}f_{\rm NL} &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{N_iN_{ij}N_j}{(N_nN_n)^2} + 4A\mathcal{P}_\zeta\frac{{\rm Tr}\,N^3}{(N_mN_m)^3} && (5) \\ \tau_{\rm NL} &= 2\frac{N_iN_{ij}N_{jk}N_k}{(N_nN_n)^3} + 16B\mathcal{P}_\zeta\frac{{\rm Tr}\,N^4}{(N_mN_m)^4} \,, && (6) \end{aligned}$$

where A and B are of order 1 on cosmological scales. Present observation [23] gives roughly $|f_{\rm NL}| \lesssim 100$, and absent a detection the eventual bound will be [24] $|f_{\rm NL}| \lesssim 1$. There is at present no bound on $\tau_{\rm NL}$ from modern data, and no estimate of the bound that will eventually be possible. (A crude bound from COBE data [13] is $|\tau_{\rm NL}| < 10^8$.)

d. Dominance by a single field perturbation If only one field σ is relevant, Eq. (2) becomes in an obvious notation

$$\zeta(t,\mathbf{x}) = N_\sigma\delta\sigma + \frac{1}{2}N_{\sigma\sigma}(\delta\sigma)^2 \,, \tag{7}$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\zeta &\simeq {N_\sigma}^2(H_k/2\pi)^2 && (8) \\ n-1 &\simeq 2\eta_{\sigma\sigma} - 2\epsilon - \frac{2}{M_{\rm P}^2{N_\sigma}^2} \,. && (9) \end{aligned}$$

Because the first term of Eq. (7) dominates,

$$-\frac{3}{5}f_{\rm NL} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{N_{\sigma\sigma}}{{N_\sigma}^2} \,, \tag{10}$$

and [13] $\tau_{\rm NL} = 36{f_{\rm NL}}^2/23$. In this case, $f_{\rm NL}$ may equivalently be defined by writing $\zeta = \zeta_{\rm g} - \frac{3}{5}\zeta_{\rm g}^2$ where $\zeta_{\rm g}$ is gaussian.[4]

If σ is the adiabatic component ϕ of the inflaton, $\delta\phi$ is just a shift back and forth along the trajectory, making

---

[3] The general formula for $\tau_{\rm NL}$ follows from the special cases in [13] but has not been written down before. For $f_{\rm NL}$, the scale-dependence of the spectra is taken into account in [22].

[4] Following [12, 13, 18] I am defining $f_{\rm NL}$ through the curvature perturbation. An alternative definition of $f_{\rm NL}$ works with the Bardeen potential. The two definitions coincide in first-order perturbation theory but differ at second order.

δN time-independent with

$$M_{\rm P}^2 N_\phi^2 = \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \tag{11}$$

$$N_{\phi\phi} = (2\epsilon - \eta) N_\phi^2 \,, \tag{12}$$

where $\eta \equiv M_{\rm P}^2 V''/V$ is another slow-roll parameter. Both ϵ and η are to be evaluated at horizon exit in these expressions.

Putting Eq. (11) into Eqs. (8) and (9) reproduces the usual expressions

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta = \frac{1}{2M_{\rm P}^2\epsilon}\left(\frac{H_k}{2\pi}\right)^2 \tag{13}$$

$$n - 1 = 2\eta - 6\epsilon \,. \tag{14}$$

Putting Eqs. (11) and (12) into Eq. (10) gives $|f_{\rm NL}| \ll 1$. This means [12, 20] that the non-gaussianity is too small to observe, as was first demonstrated in a different way by Maldacena [18]. In this case the tensor fraction of the density perturbation is $r = 16\epsilon$.[5] The tensor may eventually be observable [19] if $r \gtrsim 10^{-4}$.

If σ is some other field, its contribution compared with that of ϕ will be

$$\left(\frac{\zeta_\sigma}{\zeta_\phi}\right)^2 \sim \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\sigma}}{\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\phi}} = \frac{N_\sigma^2}{N_\phi^2} \gg 1 \,. \tag{15}$$

Then the middle term of Eq. (9) becomes negligible giving

$$n - 1 = 2\eta_{\sigma\sigma} - 2\epsilon \,. \tag{16}$$

Since the tensor perturbation depends only on H the tensor fraction r is reduced;

$$r = 16\epsilon \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\phi}}{\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\sigma}} \ll 16\epsilon \,. \tag{17}$$

It will never be observable if $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\phi}/\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\sigma}$ is bigger than about 10^5. On the other hand, non-gaussianity given by Eq. (10) could be observable.

e. Generating some curvature perturbation at the end of inflation To see how a contribution to the curvature perturbation may be generated at the end of inflation, consider first single-component inflation, where there is a unique inflationary trajectory $V(\phi)$, giving ϕ as a unique function of. proper time τ up to a shift in the origin. All functions of ϕ and its derivatives will also be unique, including the energy density $\rho = V + \frac{1}{2} d^2\phi/d\tau^2$.

At each position inflation ends when ϕ has some value $\phi_{\rm e}$. Usually it is assumed that the end of inflation is controlled entirely by the inflaton, so that $\phi_{\rm e}$ is independent of position. Then inflation ends on a spacetime slice of uniform energy density. The new possibility, considered here for the first time, is that $\phi_{\rm e}$ depends on some field σ, whose potential is so flat that it has practically no effect on the inflaton trajectory (consistent with the assumption of single-component inflation). Then $\phi_{\rm e}(\sigma)$ will depend on position through the perturbation $\delta\sigma(\mathbf{x})$. As a result the change $N_{\rm ba}$, from a spacetime slice of uniform density just *before* the end of inflation, to a spacetime slice of uniform density just *after* the end of inflation will have a perturbation $\delta N_{\rm ba} \equiv \zeta_{\rm e}(\mathbf{x})$. (Indeed, $N_{\rm ba}$ will bigger, the bigger is the delay in the end of inflation.) This quantity $\zeta_{\rm e}$ is the contribution to the curvature perturbation generated by the end of inflation, which might dominate the inflaton contribution ζ_ϕ.

In the case of multi-component inflation there is a family of curved inflationary trajectories in, say, a two-dimensional field space. In our part of the Universe one of the trajectories is the unperturbed trajectory, but the perturbation in the field orthogonal to the trajectory at horizon exit kicks the local evolution onto nearby trajectories, causing ζ to vary after horizon exit.

If ζ has settled down to a constant value by the end of inflation, corresponding to all trajectories becoming essentially equivalent straight lines, the generation of a contribution to the curvature perturbation at the end of inflation goes through in exactly the way that we described for the single-component case. In particular, $\zeta_{\rm e}$ vanishes unless some field other than the, by now essentially unique, inflaton comes into play.

If instead the family of trajectories is still curved as the end of inflation is approached, the situation is quite different. There is now no reason for inflation to end on a slice of uniform density, and one expects that $\zeta_{\rm e}$ will be nonzero even if the multi-component inflaton completely determines the end of inflation. In the case of hybrid inflation, this is because one expects different components of the inflaton to have different couplings to the waterfall field. In the case of non-hybrid inflation, the end of inflation on a given local trajectory will occur when at least one of the parameters ϵ or η has a value of order 1. But that value depends on the local trajectory which (in contrast with single-component inflation) depends on position, and in any case the slices of uniform ϵ, uniform η and uniform ρ will all be different. Again, we see that $\zeta_{\rm e}$ is expected to be nonzero, just because there is a family of inflationary trajectories which are still inequivalent as the end of inflation approaches.

f. The sudden-end approximation To have a clean result, let us suppose that slow-roll inflation suddenly gives way to radiation domination. This case may be realistic in a hybrid inflation model where the waterfall field is quite heavy, and in any case the calculation should give a feel for the sort of effect that might be possible. We will denote quantities evaluated at the end of inflation by a subscript e.

As slow-roll persists right up to the end, expansion during inflation is far more rapid than it is afterward, and $\zeta_{\rm e}$ is practically equal to the number of extra e-folds of inflation. Expanding to second order in the field perturbations, the perturbation in $\phi_{\rm e}(\sigma)$ is

---

[5] I adopt the current definition of r in terms of the spectra. An older definition using the CMB quadrupole corresponds to $r = 12.4\epsilon$.

$$\delta\phi_{\rm e} = {\phi_{\rm e}}'\delta\sigma + \frac{1}{2}{\phi_{\rm e}}''(\delta\sigma)^2 \,. \tag{18}$$

During inflation, the derivatives of $N(\phi)$ are given by Eqs. (11) and (12) and we denote them respectively by ${N_{\rm e}}'$ and ${N_{\rm e}}''$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{\rm e} &= {N_{\rm e}}'\delta\phi_{\rm e} + \frac{1}{2}{N_{\rm e}}''(\delta\phi_{\rm e})^2 \qquad (19)\\ &= {N_{\rm e}}'{\phi_{\rm e}}'\delta\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\left[2{N_{\rm e}}''{\phi_{\rm e}}'^2 + {N_{\rm e}}'{\phi_{\rm e}}''\right](\delta\sigma)^2 \,. \qquad (20) \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume that $\zeta_{\rm e}$ dominates ζ_ϕ, corresponding to

$${\phi_{\rm e}}'^2 \gg \frac{\epsilon_{\rm e}}{\epsilon_k} \,. \tag{21}$$

Then Eq. (20) is dominated by the first term, giving

$$\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_{\rm e}} = \frac{{\phi_{\rm e}}'^2}{2\epsilon_{\rm e}}\left(\frac{H_k}{2\pi}\right)^2 \,. \tag{22}$$

The spectral index is given in terms of $V_{\sigma\sigma}$ by Eq. (16). The non-gaussianity is given by (10) (imposing $\epsilon_{\rm e} \ll 1$ and $|\eta_{\rm e}| \ll 1$) as

$$-\frac{3}{5}f_{\rm NL} = \frac{\sqrt{2\epsilon_{\rm e}}}{2}\frac{{\phi_{\rm e}}''}{({\phi_{\rm e}}')^2} \,, \tag{23}$$

which could be observable.

g. A concrete model Let us apply these formulas to a concrete model of inflation;

$$\begin{aligned} V &= V_0 - \frac{1}{2}m_\chi^2\chi^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda\chi^4 + \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_\phi\phi^2\chi^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\lambda_\sigma\sigma^2\chi^2 + V_\sigma(\sigma) \,. \qquad (24) \end{aligned}$$

This is the original hybrid inflation model [25], except for the last term two terms. One of them specifies the interaction of σ with the waterfall field χ, and the other gives its potential during inflation. The interaction corresponds to an inhomogeneous mass-squared for the waterfall field;

$$-m_\chi^2(\sigma) = -m_\chi^2 + \lambda_\sigma\sigma^2 \,, \tag{25}$$

which is required to be negative.

During inflation the waterfall field χ is pinned at the origin. leaving just $V_\sigma(\sigma)$ which we assume makes σ light ($|\eta_{\sigma\sigma}| \ll 1$) and has negligible slope. Inflation ends when χ is destabilized, corresponding to

$$\lambda_\phi{\phi_{\rm e}}^2 + \lambda_\sigma\sigma^2 = m_\chi^2 \,. \tag{26}$$

The only effect of the extra term is to make $\phi_{\rm e}$ a function of the new field σ. As in the original model, we require $\phi_{\rm e} \ll M_{\rm P}$, so that inflation after the observable Universe leaves the horizon takes place entirely in the regime $\phi \ll M_{\rm P}$. As a result ϵ is completely negligible, which has two consequences. First the tensor fraction is unobservably small [27]. Second the spectral tilt, if big enough to be observable, will be given by just the first term of the appropriate equation (4), (9) or (16).

The derivatives of $\phi_{\rm e}(\sigma)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} {\phi_{\rm e}}' &= -\frac{\lambda_\sigma\sigma}{\lambda_\phi\phi_{\rm e}} \qquad (27)\\ {\phi_{\rm e}}'' &= -\frac{\lambda_\sigma}{\lambda_\phi\phi_{\rm e}}\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_\sigma\sigma^2}{\lambda_\phi\phi_{\rm e}^2}\right) \,. \qquad (28) \end{aligned}$$

Putting them into Eq. (20) gives $\zeta_{\rm e}$, whose spectrum is

$$\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_{\rm e}} = \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{\rm e}}\left(\frac{\lambda_\sigma\sigma}{\lambda_\phi\phi_{\rm e}}\right)^2\left(\frac{H_k}{2\pi}\right)^2 \,. \tag{29}$$

The condition for $\zeta_{\rm e}$ to dominate ζ_ϕ is[6]

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_\sigma\sigma}{\lambda_\phi\phi_{\rm e}}\right)^2 \gg \frac{\epsilon_{\rm e}}{\epsilon_k} = e^{-2N_{\rm e}\eta} \,, \tag{30}$$

with $\eta = m_\phi^2 M_{\rm P}^2/V_0$. If it does dominate, the spectral index is given by Eq. (9) and has nothing to do with η. Therefore η can have any value $\ll 1$, and for a crude order of magnitude estimate it should even be possible to consider $\eta \sim 1$. As a result the right hand side of Eq. (30) can be far below 1, and so can the left hand side.

Let us assume that $\zeta_{\rm e}$ dominates. Then the spectral tilt, if observable, is $n - 1 = 2\eta_{\sigma\sigma}$. The non-gaussianity parameter, if observable, is

$$-\frac{3}{5}f_{\rm NL} = \frac{\eta}{2}\left(\frac{\lambda_\phi\phi_{\rm e}^2}{\lambda_\sigma\sigma^2}\right) \,. \tag{31}$$

The predictions of the model involve the unperturbed field value σ and its effective mass parameter $\eta_{\sigma\sigma}$. The unperturbed value should be taken as the mean of $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ within the observable Universe, as opposed to its value in some exponentially larger region [13]. This situation has been discussed previously for the curvaton [4, 17] (see also [26] for the axion). As σ is light it will not be trapped at a minimum of the potential even if inflation has lasted for a long time before the observable Universe enters the horizon. However in that case there will be a calculable probability distribution for σ, and one is then free to assume that the observable Universe is typical which gives the rough value of σ. Because inflation does not 'know' about σ (until the very end) it may be regarded as quite likely that the lightness condition $|\eta_{\sigma\sigma}| \ll 1$ will be very well satisfied, making the spectral tilt too small to observe. (This is in contrast with many inflation models where η increases as inflation proceeds giving a spectral tilt of order $1/N$ [27].) If the spectral tilt is big enough to observe there is some prejudice towards $n > 1$ because the peak of the probability distribution is at the minimum of $V(\sigma)$, but $n < 1$ is also quite reasonable at least if σ is a pseudo-Goldstone-Nambu-boson corresponding to a periodic potential.

---

[6] Remember that $N_{\rm e}$, the value of N at the end of inflation, is called simply N when one discusses unperturbed inflation with a value $N \simeq 60$. I am assuming $V \simeq V_0$ as in the original model.

h. Conclusion The existence of many scalar fields is mandatory if the field theory is supersymmetric, and is anyhow suggested by string theory even if the field theory is non-supersymmetric. Flat directions in field space, corresponding to a small quadratic term in the potential and a negligible quartic term, can occur in supersymmetric and conformal [28] field theories. As a result, it is reasonable to suppose that the vacuum fluctuation of several scalar fields could be promoted at horizon exit to become a classical perturbation, and to expect that one will find a variety of possible mechanisms for generating the curvature perturbation.

It has been known for a long time that the curvature perturbation changes with time if and only if the function $P(\rho)$ is inhomogeneous. It follows that a (more or less sharp) phase transition, corresponding to a change in this function, will generate some curvature perturbation if and only if it occurs on a spacetime slice which is *not* one of uniform ρ. That is one possible way of generating some of the curvature perturbation, or practically all of it. The well-known example [6] is a reheating transition ($P \simeq 0$ to $P = \rho/3$), and I have explored another example which is the transition at the end of inflation ($P \simeq -\rho$ to $P \leq \rho/3$). Judging by the hybrid inflation example, the new mechanism is very easy to implement, and can take place for a wide range of the parameters.

After the first version of this note was released, I was made aware that a different model generating a contribution to the curvature perturbation at the end of hybrid inflation was proposed in [29]. The model invokes an inhomogeneous coupling instead of an inhomogeneous mass. Also, the calculation is done by matching metric perturbations whereas I am using the δN formalism.

Acknowledgments. The author is supported by PPARC grants PPA/G/O/2002/00469, PPA/V/S/2003/00104, PPA/G/O/2002/00098 and PPA/S/2002/00272 and by EU grant MRTN-CT-2004-503369.

[1] D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, Phys. Rep. **314**, 1 (1999).
[2] A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, *Cosmological Inflation and Large Scale Structure*, (CUP, Cambridge, 2000).
[3] A. A. Starobinsky, JETP Lett. **42** (1985) 152 [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **42** (1985) 124].
[4] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Lett. B **524**, 5 (2002); T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **522**, 215 (2001) [Erratum-ibid. B **539**, 303 (2002)].
[5] S. Mollerach, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 313 (1990); A. D. Linde and V. Mukhanov, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 535 (1997); K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, Nucl. Phys. B **626**, 395 (2002).
[6] G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 023505 L. Kofman, arXiv:astro-ph/0303614.
[7] G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 083505
[8] M. Bastero-Gil, V. Di Clemente and S. F. King, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 023501 E. W. Kolb, A. Riotto and A. Vallinotto, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 043513
[9] C. W. Bauer, M. L. Graesser and M. P. Salem, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 023512
[10] T. Matsuda, arXiv:hep-ph/0509063.
[11] T. Hamazaki and H. Kodama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **96** (1996) 1123
[12] D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 121302 (2005).
[13] L. Boubekeur and D. H. Lyth, arXiv:astro-ph/0504046.
[14] M. Sasaki and E. D. Stewart, Prog. Theor. Phys. **95**, 71 (1996).
[15] D. H. Lyth, K. A. Malik and M. Sasaki, JCAP **0505** (2005) 004
[16] M. Sasaki and T. Tanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **99**, 763 (1998).
[17] K. Dimopoulos, D. H. Lyth, A. Notari and A. Riotto, JHEP **0307** (2003) 053
[18] J. Maldacena, JHEP **0305**, 013 (2003).
[19] M. Amarie, C. Hirata and U. Seljak, arXiv:astro-ph/0508293.
[20] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, astro-ph/0503692.
[21] D. H. Lyth and I. Zaballa, JCAP **10** (2005) 005.
[22] L. E. Allen, S. Gupta and D. Wands, arXiv:astro-ph/0509719.
[23] P. Creminelli, A. Nicolis, L. Senatore, M. Tegmark and M. Zaldarriaga, arXiv:astro-ph/0509029.
[24] N. Bartolo, E. Komatsu, S. Matarrese and A. Riotto, Phys. Rept. **402** (2004) 103.
[25] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **259** (1991) 38.
[26] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **201**, 437 (1988).
[27] D. H. Lyth and L. Alabidi, arXiv:astro-ph/0510441.
[28] P. H. Frampton and T. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 083530.
[29] F. Bernardeau, L. Kofman and J. P. Uzan, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 083004.